



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| | | | | |
|--|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 09/971,718 | 10/04/2001 | Ranjit N. Notani | 020431.1056 | 3043 |
| 53184 7590 03/21/2007 i2 TECHNOLOGIES US, INC. ONE i2 PLACE, 11701 LUNA ROAD DALLAS, TX 75234 | | | EXAMINER SWARTZ, JAMIE H | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3694 | |

| | | |
|--|------------|---------------|
| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| 3 MONTHS | 03/21/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/971,718 | | NOTANI ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | | Art Unit | |
| | Jamie H. Swartz | | 3694 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 February 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 32-50 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/1/02</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. The Office acknowledges the receipt of Applicant's restriction election, filed January 31, 2007. Applicant elects Group I, claims 1-31, with traverse, stating the election is not acquiescence in the propriety of the restriction or in the accuracy in the determination and/or identification of the alleged "unrelated inventions" in the subject application. Applicant's traversal is unpersuasive for the following reasons: the applicant merely restated the restriction language and did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement. While a search of the prior art for one group may overlap with that of another group, they are not co-extensive of each other and thus would represent undue burden on Office resources. Claims 32-50 are nonelected. Claims 1-31 are examined in the instant application. This restriction is made FINAL.

Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

Art Unit: 3694

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Currently the abstract is in excess of 150 words.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 11-13, 16-20, 21-23, and 26-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fisher (US 6957199 B1).

5. Regarding claim 1, Fisher teaches *a system for facilitating negotiation of a standard for inter-enterprise collaboration between trading partners* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16). Fisher teaches *a set of one or more meta-model elements each capable of being negotiated by two or more enterprises and incorporated into a negotiated meta-model that describes an agreement between the enterprises as to collaborations between the enterprises, each meta-model element in the set describing a portion of a potential standard for collaboration between enterprises* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16, col. 34, line 65- col. 38, line 19). Fisher teaches *a meta-model negotiation service* (col.

Art Unit: 3694

4, line 39– col. 12, line 16, col. 34, line 65– col. 38, line 19). Fisher teaches receiving *an indication that two or more enterprises wish to negotiate a standard for collaborations between the enterprises* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16). Fisher teaches providing *access to the set of meta-model elements* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16, col. 36, lines 37-41, col. 40, lines 16-23). Fisher teaches receiving *selections of one or more of the meta-model elements for negotiation and incorporation into a negotiated meta-model, the negotiated meta-model describing an agreement between the enterprises as to collaborations between the enterprises; facilitate negotiation of the selected meta-model elements* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16, col. 34, line 65– col. 38, line 19). Fisher teaches incorporating *negotiated meta-model elements into the negotiated meta-model for collaborations between the enterprises* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16, col. 34, line 65– col. 38, line 19). Fisher teaches communicating *the negotiated meta-model to the enterprises to enable collaborations between the enterprises according to the standard for collaborations reflected in the negotiated meta-model* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16, col. 34, line 65– col. 38, line 19).

6. Regarding claim 2, Fisher teaches wherein *the meta-model negotiation service is operable to communicate the negotiated meta-model to collaboration software of the enterprises, the collaboration software being operable to understand and collaborate according to the negotiated meta-model substantially automatically and substantially independent of modification to the collaboration software subsequent to negotiation of*

Art Unit: 3694

the meta-model (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16, col. 42, lines 52-58, col. 38, lines 58-62, col. 29, lines 36-43)

7. Regarding claim 3, Fisher teaches *wherein the agreement associated with the negotiated meta-model is machine-actionable at the collaboration software of the enterprises and reflects a private, differentiated standard for collaboration customized for particular needs of the enterprises* (col. 32, lines 39-43, col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16, col. 21, line 24 – col. 25, line 47, col. 30, lines 38-46, col. 36, lines 46- 56, col. 51, lines 7-14, col. 41, lines 45-55).

8. Regarding claim 6, Fisher teaches *wherein the set of meta-model elements is specified in a template* (col. 51, lines 1-15, col. 50, lines 31-35)

9. Regarding claim 7, Fisher teaches *wherein the meta-model negotiation service comprises a joint business planning network service (JBPNS)* (col. 39, line 26 – col. 40, line 53).

10. Regarding claim 8, Fisher teaches *wherein the meta-model negotiation service is associated with a network service provider through which the enterprises can negotiate the meta-model elements* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16).

Art Unit: 3694

11. Regarding claim 9, Fisher teaches *wherein the negotiated meta-model is represented using extensible markup language (XML)* (col. 23, line 35 – col. 24, line 2, col. 28, lines 16- 20, col. 29, lines 20-23, col. 29, line 60 – col. 30, line 37, col. 44, line 64 – col. 53, line 3)

12. Regarding claim 10, Fisher teaches *wherein a collaboration comprises execution of a business process or transaction according to the negotiated meta-model* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16).

13. Regarding claim 11, Fisher teaches *facilitating negotiation of a standard for inter-enterprise collaboration between trading partners, the method performed using one or more computers* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16). Fisher teaches *receiving an indication that two or more enterprises wish to negotiate a standard for collaborations between the enterprises* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16). Fisher teaches *providing access to a set of one or more meta-model elements, each meta-model element in the set capable of being negotiated by the enterprises and incorporated into a negotiated meta-model that describes an agreement between the enterprises as to collaborations between the enterprises, each meta-model element in the set describing a portion of a potential standard for collaboration between enterprises* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16, col. 40, line 16 – col. 42, line 42). Fisher teaches, *receiving selections of one or more of the meta-model elements for negotiation and incorporation into a negotiated meta-model, the negotiated meta-model describing an agreement between the enterprises as to*

Art Unit: 3694

collaborations between the enterprises (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16, col. 34, line 65– col. 38, line 19). Fisher teaches *facilitating negotiation of the selected meta-model elements* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16, col. 34, line 65– col. 38, line 19). Fisher teaches *incorporating negotiated meta-model elements into the negotiated meta-model for collaborations between the enterprises* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16, col. 34, line 65– col. 38, line 19). Fisher teaches *communicating the negotiated meta-model to the enterprises to enable collaborations between the enterprises according to the standard for collaborations reflected in the negotiated meta-model* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16, col. 34, line 65– col. 38, line 19).

14. Regarding claim 12, Fisher teaches further *comprising communicating the negotiated meta-model to collaboration software of the enterprises, the collaboration software being operable to understand and collaborate according to the negotiated meta-model substantially automatically and substantially independent of modification to the collaboration software subsequent to negotiation of the meta-model.* (col. 18, line 8 – col. 25, line 53, col. 29, lines 36–43, col. 42, lines 52 – 58).

15. Regarding claim 13, Fisher teaches *wherein the agreement associated with the negotiated meta-model is machine-actionable at the collaboration software of the enterprises and reflects a private, differentiated standard for collaboration customized for particular needs of the enterprises* (col. 32, lines 39–43, col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line

Art Unit: 3694

16, col. 21, line 24 – col. 25, line 47, col. 30, lines 38-46, col. 36, lines 46- 56, col. 51, lines 7-14, col. 41, lines 45-55).

16. Regarding claim 16, Fisher teaches *wherein the set of meta-model elements is specified in a template* (col. 51, lines 1-15, col. 50, lines 31-35).

17. Regarding claim 17, Fisher teaches *wherein the meta-model negotiation service comprises a joint business planning network service (JBPNS)* (col. 39, line 26 – col. 40, line 53).

18. Regarding claim 18, Fisher teaches *wherein the meta-model negotiation service is associated with a network service provider through which the enterprises can negotiate the meta-model elements* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16).

19. Regarding claim 19, Fisher teaches *wherein the negotiated meta-model is represented using extensible markup language (XML)* (col. 23, line 35 – col. 24, line 2, col. 28, lines 16- 20, col. 29, lines 20-23, col. 29, line 60 – col. 30, line 37, col. 44, line 64 – col. 53, line 3)

20. Regarding claim 20, Fisher teaches *wherein a collaboration comprises execution of a business process or transaction according to the negotiated meta-model* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16).

21. Regarding claim 21, Fisher teaches *software for facilitating negotiation of a standard for inter-enterprise collaboration between trading partners, the software embodied in computer-readable media* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16, col. 33, line 66 – col. 34, line 8, col. 59, line 20 – col. 60, line 24). Fisher teaches *receiving an indication that two or more enterprises wish to negotiate a standard for collaborations between the enterprises* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16). Fisher teaches *providing access to a set of one or more meta-model elements, each meta-model element in the set capable of being negotiated by the enterprises and incorporated into a negotiated meta-model that describes an agreement between the enterprises as to collaborations between the enterprises, each meta-model element in the set describing a portion of a potential standard for collaboration between enterprises* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16, col. 40, line 16 – col. 42, line 42). Fisher teaches *receiving selections of one or more of the meta-model elements for negotiation and incorporation into a negotiated meta-model, the negotiated meta-model describing an agreement between the enterprises as to collaborations between the enterprises* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16, col. 34, line 65– col. 38, line 19). Fisher teaches *facilitating negotiation of the selected meta-model elements* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16, col. 34, line 65– col. 38, line 19). Fisher teaches *incorporating negotiated meta-model elements into the negotiated meta-model for collaborations between the enterprises* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16, col. 34, line 65– col. 38, line 19). Fisher teaches *communicating the negotiated meta-model to the enterprises to enable collaborations between the enterprises according to the standard*

for collaborations reflected in the negotiated meta-model (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16, col. 34, line 65– col. 38, line 19).

22. Regarding claim 22, Fisher teaches *software further operable to communicate the negotiated meta-model to collaboration software of the enterprises, the collaboration software being operable to understand and collaborate according to the negotiated meta-model substantially automatically and substantially independent of modification to the collaboration software subsequent to negotiation of the meta-model (col. 18, line 8 – col. 25, line 53, col. 29, lines 36-43, col. 42, lines 52 – 58, col. 33, line 66 – col. 34, line 8).*

23. Regarding claim 23, Fisher teaches a *software wherein the agreement associated with the negotiated meta-model is machine-actionable at the collaboration software of the enterprises and reflects a private, differentiated standard for collaboration customized for particular needs of the enterprises. (col. 32, lines 39-43, col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16, col. 21, line 24 – col. 25, line 47, col. 30, lines 38-46, col. 36, lines 46– 56, col. 51, lines 7-14, col. 41, lines 45-55).*

24. Regarding claim 26, Fisher teaches a *software wherein the set of meta-model elements is specified in a template (col. 51, lines 1-15, col. 50, lines 31-35).*

Art Unit: 3694

25. Regarding claim 27, Fisher teaches *a software wherein the meta-model negotiation service comprises a joint business planning network service (JBPNS)* (col. 39, line 26 – col. 40, line 53).

26. Regarding claim 28, Fisher teaches *a software wherein the meta-model negotiation service is associated with a network service provider through which the enterprises can negotiate the meta-model elements* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16).

27. Regarding claim 29, Fisher teaches *a software wherein the negotiated meta-model is represented using extensible markup language (XML)* (col. 23, line 35 – col. 24, line 2, col. 28, lines 16- 20, col. 29, lines 20-23, col. 29, line 60 – col. 30, line 37, col. 44, line 64 – col. 53, line 3).

28. Regarding claim 30, Fisher teaches *a software wherein a collaboration comprises execution of a business process or transaction according to the negotiated meta-model* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16).

29. Regarding claim 31, Fisher teaches *a system for facilitating negotiation of a standard for inter-enterprise collaboration between trading partners* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16). Fisher teaches *means for receiving an indication that two or more enterprises wish to negotiate a standard for collaborations between the enterprises* (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16). Fisher teaches *means for providing access to a set of one*

Art Unit: 3694

or more meta-model elements, each meta-model element in the set capable of being negotiated by the enterprises and incorporated into a negotiated meta-model that describes an agreement between the enterprises as to collaborations between the enterprises, each meta-model element in the set describing a portion of a potential standard for collaboration between enterprises (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16, col. 40, line 16 – col. 42, line 42). Fisher teaches means for receiving selections of one or more of the meta-model elements for negotiation and incorporation into a negotiated meta-model, the negotiated meta-model describing an agreement between the enterprises as to collaborations between the enterprises (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16, col. 34, line 65– col. 38, line 19). Fisher teaches means for facilitating negotiation of the selected meta-model elements (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16, col. 34, line 65– col. 38, line 19). Fisher teaches means for incorporating negotiated meta-model elements into the negotiated meta-model for collaborations between the enterprises (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16, col. 34, line 65– col. 38, line 19). Fisher teaches means for communicating the negotiated meta-model to the enterprises to enable collaborations between the enterprises according to the standard for collaborations reflected in the negotiated meta-model (col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16, col. 34, line 65– col. 38, line 19).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

30. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 3694

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

31. Claims 4-5, 14-15, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher (US 6957199 B1) in view of McCormick (US 20020040352 A1).

32. Regarding claim 4, Fisher teaches a meta-model negotiation service which receives an indication of want of negotiation, provides access to a set of meta-model elements, receives selections of meta-model elements for negotiation and incorporation, facilitates negotiation of the selected meta-model elements, incorporates negotiated meta-model elements into the collaborations, and communicates the negotiated meta-model to the enterprises to enable collaboration. Fisher teaches *role types* (col. 14, line 57 – col. 23, line 18). Fisher teaches *access of particular role types to particular dimensionalities* (col. 14, line 57 – col. 23, line 18). Fisher teaches *collaborative transaction types relative to particular dimensionalities* (col. 18, line 40 – col. 25, line 36, col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16). Fisher teaches *shared operations visible to the at least two enterprises* (col. 39, lines 25- 62). Fisher does not teach dimensions with a supply chain element, dimensionalities with a combination of supply chain elements, or temporal structures. However, McCormick teaches *dimensions each comprising a supply chain element* (§ 17-18). McCormick teaches *dimensionalities each comprising a combination of supply chain elements* (§ 17-18). McCormick teaches *temporal structures of collaborative transactions* (§ 50). Fisher's invention creates partnerships over a public network providing authenticated users with an environment suitable for

Art Unit: 3694

conducting business transactions requiring a high level of trust. Similarly McCormick's invention is a network that facilitates the transaction of the exchange of goods and services, which involves registering participants. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Fisher to include the specific details of supply chain elements and the temporal structure. Fisher helps to establish trade relationships and does not limit the scope of what is being traded. Though Fisher does not specifically state the items to be traded to be supply chain elements within the context of the invention what is traded could be supply chain elements. A temporal database has a built in time aspect. It is important when working with any type of data of include valid-time and transaction-time to be sure the time period is modeled in reality and when the data is stored in the database. Accurate time records are legal required for accounting standards. It is important that transactions are time stamped.

33. Regarding claim 5, Fisher teaches a meta-model negotiation service which receives an indication of want of negotiation, provides access to a set of meta-model elements, receives selections of meta-model elements for negotiation and incorporation, facilitates negotiation of the selected meta-model elements, incorporates negotiated meta-model elements into the collaborations, and communicates the negotiated meta-model to the enterprises to enable collaboration. Fisher teaches *whether the transaction is a system of record or whether synchronization must occur with another system of record* (col. 39, line 26 – col. 40, line 53). Fisher does not teach structure of transaction, data elements, state model describing the cycle, accessing that a role type has data

Art Unit: 3694

elements, or actions that a role type can execute. However, McCormick teaches *structure of the transaction* (§§ 20-50, 110-111, 762-809, 860). McCormick teaches *data elements associated with the transaction* (§§ 40, 50, 187). McCormick teaches a *state model describing a life cycle of the transaction* (§§ 630, 992, 866-875, 1243). McCormick teaches *access that a role type has to data elements of the transaction relative to a state of the transaction* (§§ 20-53, 109-145). McCormick teaches *actions that a role type can execute on the transaction relative to a state of the transaction* (20-53, 109-145, 757-834). Fisher's invention creates partnerships over a public network providing authenticated users with an environment suitable for conducting business transactions requiring a high level of trust. Similarly McCormick's invention is a network that facilitates the transaction of the exchange of goods and services, which involves registering participants. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Fisher to include the specific details of structure of transaction, data elements, state model describing the cycle, accessing that a role type has data elements, or actions that a role type can execute. It would have been obvious to include the details of a structure of transaction, as a predicable transaction structure allows automated processing of a transaction. It would have been obvious to include data elements associated with the transaction because in the absence of data elements the transaction would be meaningless. It would have been obvious to include the state modeling which is necessary to prevent partial role back of the transaction. It would have been obvious to include access and action that a role type has to data elements in order to control who can access as well as who can modify and view data for security

Art Unit: 3694

reasons. This will limit change and viewing to appropriate circumstances and by certain people at certain times.

34. Regarding claim 14, Fisher teaches a meta-model negotiation service which receives an indication of want of negotiation, provides access to a set of meta-model elements, receives selections of meta-model elements for negotiation and incorporation, facilitates negotiation of the selected meta-model elements, incorporates negotiated meta-model elements into the collaborations, and communicates the negotiated meta-model to the enterprises to enable collaboration. Fisher teaches *role types* (col. 14, line 57 – col. 23, line 18). Fisher teaches *access of particular role types to particular dimensionalities* (col. 14, line 57 – col. 23, line 18). Fisher teaches *collaborative transaction types relative to particular dimensionalities* (col. 18, line 40 – col. 25, line 36, col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16). Fisher teaches *shared operations visible to the at least two enterprises* (col. 39, lines 25- 62). Fisher does not teach dimensions with a supply chain element, dimensionalities with a combination of supply chain elements, or temporal structures. However, McCormick teaches *dimensions each comprising a supply chain element* (§ 17-18). McCormick teaches *dimensionalities each comprising a combination of supply chain elements* (§ 17-18). McCormick teaches *temporal structures of collaborative transactions* (§ 50). Fisher's invention creates partnerships over a public network providing authenticated users with an environment suitable for conducting business transactions requiring a high level of trust. Similarly McCormick's invention is a network that facilitates the transaction of the exchange of goods and

Art Unit: 3694

services, which involves registering participants. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Fisher to include the specific details of supply chain elements and the temporal structure. Fisher helps to establish trade relationships and does not limit the scope of what is being traded. Though Fisher does not specifically state the items to be traded to be supply chain elements within the context of the invention what is traded could be supply chain elements. A temporal database has a built in time aspect. It is important when working with any type of data of include valid-time and transaction-time to be sure the time period is modeled in reality and when the data is stored in the database. Accurate time records are legal required for accounting standards. It is important that transactions are time stamped.

35. Regarding claim 15, Fisher teaches a meta-model negotiation service which receives an indication of want of negotiation, provides access to a set of meta-model elements, receives selections of meta-model elements for negotiation and incorporation, facilitates negotiation of the selected meta-model elements, incorporates negotiated meta-model elements into the collaborations, and communicates the negotiated meta-model to the enterprises to enable collaboration. Fisher teaches *whether the transaction is a system of record or whether synchronization must occur with another system of record* (col. 39, line 26 – col. 40, line 53). Fisher does not teach structure of transaction, data elements, state model describing the cycle, accessing that a role type has data elements, or actions that a role type can execute. However, McCormick teaches *structure of the transaction* (§20-50, 110-111, 762-809, 860). McCormick teaches *data*

Art Unit: 3694

elements associated with the transaction (§ 40, 50, 187). McCormick teaches *a state model describing a life cycle of the transaction* (§ 630, 992, 866-875, 1243). McCormick teaches *access that a role type has to data elements of the transaction relative to a state of the transaction* (§ 20-53, 109-145). McCormick teaches *actions that a role type can execute on the transaction relative to a state of the transaction* (20-53, 109-145, 757-834). Fisher's invention creates partnerships over a public network providing authenticated users with an environment suitable for conducting business transactions requiring a high level of trust. Similarly McCormick's invention is a network that facilitates the transaction of the exchange of goods and services, which involves registering participants. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Fisher to include the specific details of structure of transaction, data elements, state model describing the cycle, accessing that a role type has data elements, or actions that a role type can execute. It would have been obvious to include the details of a structure of transaction, as a predicable transaction structure allows automated processing of a transaction. It would have been obvious to include data elements associated with the transaction because in the absence of data elements the transaction would be meaningless. It would have been obvious to include the state modeling which is necessary to prevent partial roll back of the transaction. It would have been obvious to include access and action that a role type has to data elements in order to control who can access as well as who can modify and view data for security reasons. This will limit change and viewing to appropriate circumstances and by certain people at certain times.

36. Regarding claim 24, Fisher teaches a meta-model negotiation service which receives an indication of want of negotiation, provides access to a set of meta-model elements, receives selections of meta-model elements for negotiation and incorporation, facilitates negotiation of the selected meta-model elements, incorporates negotiated meta-model elements into the collaborations, and communicates the negotiated meta-model to the enterprises to enable collaboration. Fisher teaches *role types* (col. 14, line 57 – col. 23, line 18). Fisher teaches *access of particular role types to particular dimensionalities* (col. 14, line 57 – col. 23, line 18). Fisher teaches *collaborative transaction types relative to particular dimensionalities* (col. 18, line 40 – col. 25, line 36, col. 4, line 39– col. 12, line 16). Fisher teaches *shared operations visible to the at least two enterprises* (col. 39, lines 25- 62). Fisher does not teach dimensions with a supply chain element, dimensionalities with a combination of supply chain elements, or temporal structures. However, McCormick teaches *dimensions each comprising a supply chain element* (§ 17-18). McCormick teaches *dimensionalities each comprising a combination of supply chain elements* (§ 17-18). McCormick teaches *temporal structures of collaborative transactions* (§ 50). Fisher's invention creates partnerships over a public network providing authenticated users with an environment suitable for conducting business transactions requiring a high level of trust. Similarly McCormick's invention is a network that facilitates the transaction of the exchange of goods and services, which involves registering participants. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Fisher to include the specific

Art Unit: 3694

details of supply chain elements and the temporal structure. Fisher helps to establish trade relationships and does not limit the scope of what is being traded. Though Fisher does not specifically state the items to be traded to be supply chain elements within the context of the invention what is traded could be supply chain elements. A temporal database has a built in time aspect. It is important when working with any type of data of include valid-time and transaction-time to be sure the time period is modeled in reality and when the data is stored in the database. Accurate time records are legal required for accounting standards. It is important that transactions are time stamped.

37. Regarding claim 25, Fisher teaches a meta-model negotiation service which receives an indication of want of negotiation, provides access to a set of meta-model elements, receives selections of meta-model elements for negotiation and incorporation, facilitates negotiation of the selected meta-model elements, incorporates negotiated meta-model elements into the collaborations, and communicates the negotiated meta-model to the enterprises to enable collaboration. Fisher teaches *whether the transaction is a system of record or whether synchronization must occur with another system of record* (col. 39, line 26 – col. 40, line 53). Fisher does not teach structure of transaction, data elements, state model describing the cycle, accessing that a role type has data elements, or actions that a role type can execute. However, McCormick teaches *structure of the transaction* (§§20-50, 110-111, 762-809, 860). McCormick teaches *data elements associated with the transaction* (§§ 40, 50, 187). McCormick teaches a *state model describing a life cycle of the transaction* (§§ 630, 992, 866-875, 1243). McCormick

Art Unit: 3694

teaches *access that a role type has to data elements of the transaction relative to a state of the transaction* (§ 20-53, 109-145). McCormick teaches *actions that a role type can execute on the transaction relative to a state of the transaction* (20-53, 109-145, 757-834). Fisher's invention creates partnerships over a public network providing authenticated users with an environment suitable for conducting business transactions requiring a high level of trust. Similarly McCormick's invention is a network that facilitates the transaction of the exchange of goods and services, which involves registering participants. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Fisher to include the specific details of structure of transaction, data elements, state model describing the cycle, accessing that a role type has data elements, or actions that a role type can execute. It would have been obvious to include the details of a structure of transaction, as a predicable transaction structure allows automated processing of a transaction. It would have been obvious to include data elements associated with the transaction because in the absence of data elements the transaction would be meaningless. It would have been obvious to include the state modeling which is necessary to prevent partial roll back of the transaction. It would have been obvious to include access and action that a role type has to data elements in order to control who can access as well as who can modify and view data for security reasons. This will limit change and viewing to appropriate circumstances and by certain people at certain times.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jamie H. Swartz whose telephone number is (571) 272-7363. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-4:30pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on (571) 272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jamie Swartz
March 12, 2007


ELLA COLBERT
PRIMARY EXAMINER